



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,070	06/14/2000	Terry L. Oehrke	1234	7636

7590 07/09/2003

Harley R Ball
Sprint Law Department
8140 Ward Parkway
Mailstop MOKCMP0506
Kansas City, MO 64114

EXAMINER

DELGADO, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/594,070

Applicant(s)

OEHRKE, TERRY L.

Examiner

Michael S. A. Delgado

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9,12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. New corrected drawings are required in this application because The references on figure 3 are unclear. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 and 12 objected to because of the following informalities: "operably" should be operable. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2143

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claim 1-4, 7-12 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,438,583 by McDowell et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,047,331 by Medard et al.

In claim 1, McDowell teaches about a method for providing a messaging service on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of (Fig 1):

(a) routing a message to a messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60);

(b) providing the message to a relay server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60); and

But fails to teach (c) re-routing the message from the relay server to the messaging server when operational.

The concept of re-routing a message to an operable destination via a different path is well known in the art as disclosed by Medard (Col 10, lines 20-40). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for some of ordinary skill to provide a rerouting scheme to insure that important messages are delivered to their destination despite a failure occurring.

The delivery of important message is crucial in the world of business. To avoid non-delivery, redundant network elements are deployed as backup means. In this way, if one path is down there will always be a back up path.

In claim 2, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 1 further comprising:

(d) invoking another messaging server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server in step (c) (Col 1, lines 45-60) (Fig 1).

In claim 3, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 2 further comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

(e) routing the message to the other messaging server of step (d) (Col 1, lines 45-60), (Fig 1).

In claim 4, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 3:

further comprising (f) storing the message (Col 7, lines 1-10); and

wherein step (e) comprises changing server information of the stored message (Col 7, lines 1-10).

In claim 7, the method of Claim 1 further comprising:

(d) sending the message to the messaging server in response to step (c) (Covered in claim 1).

In claim 8, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 3 further comprising:

(f) sending the message to the other messaging server in response to step (e) (Col 1, lines 45-60).

In claim 9, McDowell teaches about a computer network for providing a messaging service, the network comprising:

a messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60);

a DNS server operable to route a message to the messaging server (Col 5, lines 30-40);

and

a relay server operably connected to the DNS server and the messaging server, the DNS server operable to provide the message to the relay server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60);

wherein the relay server is operable to re-route the message from the relay server to the messaging server (Covered in claim 1).

Art Unit: 2143

In claim 10, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 1 further comprising:
another messaging server, the other messaging server invoked by the relay server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server in response to the re-routing (Col 1, lines 45-60), (Fig 1).

In claim 11, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 10 wherein the relay server is operable to route the message to the other messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60), (Fig 1).

In claim 12, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 11:
a storage device operably connected to the relay server and the other messaging server, the message being stored in the storage device (Col 7, lines 1-10); and
wherein the relay server is operable to change server information of the stored message to route the message to the other messaging server (Col 7, lines 1-10).

In claim 15, the network of Claim 9 wherein the relay server is operable to send the message to the messaging server in response the re-routing (Covered in claim 1).

In claim 16, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 11 wherein the relay server is operable to send the message to the other messaging server in response to routing the message to the other messaging server (Col 1, lines 45-60), (Fig 1).

In claim 17, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 9 wherein the messaging server and the relay server are within a first data center (Fig 1).

In claim 18, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 10 wherein the messaging server and the other messaging server are in first and second data centers, the first data center remote from the second data center (Fig 1).

Art Unit: 2143

In claim 19, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 9 wherein the relay server is operable to invoke a process to create another messaging server with a same name and IP address (Col 5, lines 15-40).

Claim 5-6, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,438,583 by McDowell et al. and US Patent No. 6,047,331 by Medard et al in view of US Patent No. 6,182,224 by Doshi et al.

In claim 5 McDowell and Medard teach all the limitation except the action of periodically attempting to deliver a message to the message server.

Doshi teaches about a messaging system in which a destination node is check periodically to determine if destination node is ready to receive a message (Col 15, line 50 -Col 16, line 15). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for some one of ordinary skill to periodically poll a destination server to insure that it is available to receive a message.

In network operation, there are different types of failures. Some failures are more permanent while others are temporary. In the case of a temporary failure, service can be reinstated as soon as the destination is available without going through the complication of rerouting. To avoid the complication of rerouting, the destination server is poll periodically for predetermine period until there is some certainty that the failure is serious. In this scenario, a more complex rerouting is needed to deliver the message.

In claim 6 and 14, McDowell teaches about a method of Claim 5 further comprising:

(d) invoking another messaging server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server in step (c) (Col 1, lines 45-60).

Art Unit: 2143

In claim 13 the network of Claim 9 wherein the relay server is operable to periodically attempt delivery of the message from the relay server to the messaging server (Covered in claim 5).

In claim 14, McDowell teaches about a network of Claim 13 wherein the relay server is operable to invoke a process to create another messaging server when the message is undeliverable to the messaging server in response to the re-routing (Col 1, lines 45-60), (Fig 1).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US patent No. 6,108,709 by Shinomura teaches about a data sending apparatus for message transmission to external receiving terminal - has user interface to message input with first database for address information and second database for temporary storage of message, with associated sending mechanism together with alternate forwarding arrangement

US patent No. 6,542,934 by Bader et al., teaches about a non-disruptively rerouting network communications from a secondary network path to a primary path.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael S. A. Delgado whose telephone number is 703-305-8057. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2143

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.



MD

June 19, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100